

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

**A. Formal Matters**

The office action objected to the title as not descriptive. [07/10/07 Office Action at 2]. The title is amended to read “IMAGE REPRODUCTION APPARATUS, METHOD AND PROGRAM”. Applicant respectfully submits that the title is now consistent with the description of the invention recited in the claim preambles and that the Patent Office’s objection has been overcome and that the amended title is indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. If the objection is maintained, Applicant asks that the Examiner please explain the reason in more detail.

**B. Status Of The Claims And Explanation Of Amendments**

Claims 1-8 are pending. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7 and 8 have been amended. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the application as originally filed, including Figure 1 and its associated text at specification page 7, line 19 through page 12, line 23 (paragraphs 28-51). No new matter is introduced by entry of these amendments, and entry is respectfully requested.

**C. Claim Rejections**

The office action rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for allegedly claiming non-statutory subject matter. [07/10/07 Office Action at 2]. Claim 8 is amended to recite, *inter alia*, “A program on a computer-readable medium”. Applicant respectfully asserts that the § 101 rejection is overcome and that claim 8 is allowable.

The office action rejected claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for allegedly being unpatentable over Anderson U.S. Patent No. 5,933,137 (“Anderson”) in view of Stam et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,850,691 (“Stam”). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for reasons set forth below.

The rejections of claims 1-8 are respectfully traversed. As explained more fully below, the requirements for such rejections are not met since neither reference teaches, discloses or suggests the claim 1 element:

“a control unit configured to cause the display unit to successively display a low-resolution image of the plurality of image files at fast speed while the operating unit is in a predetermined operating state, and to display a high-resolution image corresponding to a prior low-resolution image of a predetermined number of images prior to the low-resolution image displayed on the display unit when the operating unit is released from the predetermined operating state, without displaying the prior low-resolution image.”

The office action acknowledges that Anderson does not disclose this feature of the invention, but asserts that it would be obvious in view of Stam [07/10/07 Office Action at 3-4]. Stam relates to an automatic playback overshoot correction system for multimedia devices such as VCRs, DVD players, and MP3 players. Stam discloses a prediction of the position (overshoot correction) in a program material where the user expects to be when the user stops the fast forward or reverse mode. Stam further discloses an adaptation to the user by remembering how much the user corrects after he stops the fast forward or reverse mode, and an initial test of the user’s reaction time using a test video. [Col. 20, line 59 – col. 21, line 53].

However, nothing has been found in Stam to teach, disclose or suggest that the control unit “display[s] a high-resolution image corresponding to a prior-low-resolution image... without displaying the prior low-resolution image” as recited in Applicant’s claim 1.

Applicant finds that a combination of Anderson and Stam can only lead to a technique in which, when there is an instruction to stop the fast-forwarding, a predetermined number of frames are back-tracked, and, first, a low-resolution image is displayed, and after that, a high-resolution image corresponding to the low-resolution image is displayed.

On the other hand, in the present invention, when there is an instruction to stop the fast-forwarding, a high-resolution image is displayed directly “without displaying the prior low-resolution image”. Accordingly, the present invention eliminates the wastefulness of re-extending and displaying a low-resolution image corresponding to a high-resolution image which will ultimately be displayed after back-tracking a predetermined number of frames.

Accordingly, a combination of Stam and Anderson would not disclose or suggest at least the above-mentioned feature recited in claim 1. Applicant has not specifically addressed the rejections of the dependent claims 2-6. Applicant respectfully submits that the independent claim 1, from which they depend, is in condition for allowance as set forth above. Accordingly, the dependent claims, 2-6 are also in condition for allowance.

For similar reasons, independent claims 7 and 8 are also patentably distinct from the cited references.

Appl. No. 10/774,254  
Paper dated October 10, 2007  
Reply to Office Action dated July 10, 2007

**CONCLUSION**

For the above-stated reasons, this application is respectfully asserted to be in condition for allowance. An early and favorable examination on the merits is requested. In the event that a telephone conference would facilitate the examination of this application in any way, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number provided.

THE COMMISSIONER IS HEREBY AUTHORIZED TO CHARGE ANY ADDITIONAL FEES WHICH MAY BE REQUIRED FOR THE TIMELY CONSIDERATION OF THIS AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 AND 1.17, OR CREDIT ANY OVERPAYMENT TO DEPOSIT ACCOUNT NO. 13-4500, ORDER NO. 1232-5278.

Respectfully submitted,  
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: October 10, 2007

By:



Robert K. Goethals  
Registration No. 36,813

Correspondence Address:

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.  
3 World Financial Center  
New York, NY 10281-2101  
(212) 415-8700 Telephone  
(212) 415-8701 Facsimile